INTERPRETATION OF THE EVOLUTION PARAMETER OF THE FEYNMAN PARAMETRIZATION OF THE DIRAC EQUATION

Juan P. APARICIO,[1] Fabián H. GAIOLI,[1,2,*] and Edgardo T. GARCIA ALVAREZ[1,2,†]
[1] *Departamento de Física, Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Buenos Aires, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*
[2] *Instituto de Astronomía y Física del Espacio, C.C. 67, Suc. 28, 1428 Buenos Aires, Argentina*
(February 1, 2008)

The Feynman parametrization of the Dirac equation is considered in order to obtain an indefinite mass formulation of relativistic quantum mechanics. It is shown that the parameter that labels the evolution is related to the proper time. The Stückelberg interpretation of antiparticles naturally arises from the formalism.

Pacs number: 03.65.Pm

arXiv:quant-ph/9502015v1 16 Feb 1995

*e-mail: gaioli@iafe.uba.ar, fax: 54 1 786 8114
†e-mail: galvarez@dfuba.df.uba.ar, fax: 54 1 786 8114

Relativistic quantum mechanics (RQM) parametrized by a "proper time" has been a powerful device used long ago. The leading idea of a proper time formalism rests on considering states that evolve with a Schrödinger equation with a "scalar" Hamiltonian which plays the role of a mass operator. The framework, which provides indefinite mass states as well as the Stückelberg [1] interpretation for antiparticles, allows avoiding the well-known difficulties of RQM [2]. In other words, admitting particles moving backward in time, we may keep a one-particle formalism without appealing to the standard solution given by the second quantization scheme [3].

The origin of this subject goes back to the earlier works of Dirac [4], Fock [5], Stückelberg [1], Feynman [6,7], Nambu [8], and Schwinger [9]. More recently, in this line of research we can mention the relativistic dynamics (RD) by Horwitz *et al.* [10], the four space formulation (FSF) by Fanchi *et al.* [11], and the works of the French school (Vigier *et al.* [12]), mainly developed in the spin 0 case [13], which have in common squared mass operators as Hamiltonians.

RD and FSF approaches use a Fock-like parametrization given by

$$-i\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}\Phi = \frac{p^\mu p_\mu}{2M}\Phi \qquad (c=\hbar=1) \tag{1}$$

in the free case. This parametrization is very interesting because it can be seen as a representation of a five dimensional Galilei group [14], which introduces a sort of "super-mass" M (with units of mass) as a new label for characterizing the indefinite mass system mentioned above. The French school uses the Stückelberg-Schwinger [1,9] parametrization [15], which can be obtained from Eq. (1) by rescaling the dimension of the evolution parameter τ and taking M equal to $1/2$.

It is well known that, taking the "on-shell" condition[1] in the classical limit, one can recover the usual relativistic mechanics from these parametrizations. However, in the classical limit the evolution parameter τ is related to the proper time s by means of $ds^2 = (m_0^2/M^2)d\tau^2$. Therefore, τ is not equal to s unless one identifies $\langle p^\mu p_\mu\rangle_c = m_0^2$ with M^2 [10,11], where $\langle\ \rangle_c$ stands for the mean value after taking the classical limit (see Appendix).

The main problem of the different proposals of a parametrized RQM lies on the "off-shell" interpretation of the evolution parameter τ [16]. The different names proposed (within or without interpretation) reflect the controversy about this subject. In the past, this parameter was treated only by analogy as proper time, but it is not its accurate sense since it must be interpreted as a Newtonian time [17].

The aim of this letter is to show that, by using a different parametrization from the given in Eq. (1), an "off-shell" interpretation of the corresponding evolution parameter as the proper time can be given. In fact, by considering a first order mass operator corresponding to the parametrization of the Dirac equation originally proposed by Feynman [7] we show that, in the classical limit, the "evolution time" of this parametrization is reduced to the proper time of an indefinite mass system. As we will show in Ref. [18], unlike the interpretation given in Ref. [14] to the parametrization (1), the Feynman parametrization can be looked as a null "super-mass" representation of the de Sitter group. It immediately leads to the identification of the evolution parameter with the proper time s since in this case the arc element dS of the five-dimensional manifold associated to the de Sitter group vanishes, i.e., $dS^2 = ds^2 - dx^\mu dx_\mu = 0$ [18]. For these reasons we call s the evolution parameter of the Feynman parametrization since it is directly related to the classical proper time s, unlike the parameter τ. However, it is important to remark that, although proper time is commonly considered as an on-shell concept since it is associated with the integral of the arc element along the world line of the standard massive particles, we can extend this concept using the same definition for indefinite mass systems. Of course, by taking the on-shell condition the usual notion of proper time is recovered. In this case s is not a universal parameter in contrast with the universality implicitly involved in the off-shell theory [see Eq. (3) below]. But it is only due to the different notions of "event" and "simultaneity" considered in each case. [While two events x^μ and x'^μ are simultaneous in the standard case when $x_0 = x'_0$, in the new framework two "events" (x^μ, s) and (x'^μ, s') are "simultaneous" when $s = s'$ (see Ref. [19]).]

Finally in this letter, we also derive an important relation that allows us to relate the Feynman parametrization to some other parametrizations, that we have already mentioned.

Let us now briefly discuss the formalism [20] (a more extended development will be given elsewhere [21]).

The states of the system are determined, at a given universal scalar "time" s, by wave functions $\Psi(x,s)$ belonging to a linear space of spinorial functions, defined on the space-time manifold. This space is endowed with an indefinite bilinear Hermitian form [22,23],

$$\langle\Phi|\Psi\rangle \equiv \int \overline{\Phi}\Psi d^4x, \tag{2}$$

where $\overline{\Phi} = \Phi^\dagger\gamma^0$ is the usual Dirac adjoint. An operator A is self-adjoint according to this "scalar product"

[1]By "on-shell" condition we mean a reinterpretation of the usual mass-shell constraint as a result of the specific initial conditions. In other words, $\langle p^\mu p_\mu\rangle_c$ is a classical constant of motion [where the subscript c denotes classical ($\hbar\to 0$) mean value, see Appendix], which acts as a square mass variable that can be fixed to a particular value m_0^2, being m_0 the ordinary mass of the particle, by choosing the initial conditions [$\langle x^\mu(0)\rangle_c$ and $\langle p_\mu(0)\rangle_c$].

if $A = \overline{A}$, where $\overline{A}$ satisfies, by definition, $\langle\phi|A|\psi\rangle = \langle\psi|\overline{A}|\phi\rangle^*$, $\forall\phi,\psi$, e.g., for a spinorial operator A we have $\overline{A} = \gamma^0 A^\dagger \gamma^0$, where $\dagger$ stands for the transpose and conjugate matrix.

The "proper time" dynamics in the Schrödinger picture is provided by the Feynman parametrization of the Dirac equation [7], i.e., the evolution of a wave function $\Psi(x,s)$ is determined by

$$-i\frac{d}{ds}\Psi(x,s) = \mathcal{H}\Psi(x,s). \tag{3}$$

The Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ ($\gamma^\mu\pi_\mu$ for minimal coupling) plays the role of the standard Hamiltonian in the usual nonrelativistic theory. Therefore, the evolution operator in terms of the "time" s is $U(s) = e^{i\mathcal{H}s}$.

From (2) the spin variables γ^μ and the orbital variables p_μ and x^μ, as well as the Hamiltonian, become self-adjoint. As a consequence, the evolution operator is "unitary." This fact guarantees that the "norm" is a constant of motion. (Barut and Thacker have considered the same parametrization but they have defined a scalar product which does not preserve the norm. See Ref. [20].)

The evolution of an operator q, in the Heisenberg picture, is given by

$$\frac{dq}{ds} = -i[\mathcal{H}, q]. \tag{4}$$

The generalized eigenfunctions of $\mathcal{H}$ are definite mass states ϕ_m that satisfy the generalized eigenvalue equation, $\mathcal{H}\phi_m = m\phi_m$, having oscillatory behavior in s. They are solutions of an extended Dirac equation (note that m could be, in principle, any complex number if the norm of ϕ_m vanishes, or any real number if the norm of ϕ_m is different from zero [24]). If we assume that the orbital operators have real eigenvalues[2] (which will be considered from now on), in the free case m can take the continuous real values when the generalized eigenvalues m^2 of $\mathcal{H}^2 = p^\mu p_\mu$ are positive (tardyons) and the continuous purely imaginary values when the generalized eigenvalues m^2 of $\mathcal{H}^2 = p^\mu p_\mu$ are negative (tachyons). In the last case it can be easily checked that the generalized eigenvectors of $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to tachyons have zero norm.

We want to show that the theoretical framework we have given to the Feynman parametrization is not only an alternative formalism to the second quantization of the Dirac field [7] but it allows recovering the standard results of relativistic mechanics as well. In order to show this, we shall consider the restriction of the formalism to the "positive mass" subspace [19]. It means that the state of the system Ψ satisfies $\Lambda\Psi = \Psi$, where the "projector" [25] Λ is given by

$$\Lambda \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 + \frac{\mathcal{H}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{H}^2}}), \tag{5}$$

which is a straightforward extension of the well-known positive energy projector in the standard case. However, notice that Λ only projects onto the space corresponding to the states with mass values with positive real part for tardyons. In the case of tachyons it projects onto the space corresponding to mass values with positive purely imaginary part. This is the meaning we have given to "positive mass." This projection (analogously to what happens in the standard case) removes the "covariant *Zitterbewegung*" [26] and it will allow us to obtain a classical theory, which restricted on-shell will be the standard relativistic mechanics. (An off-shell classical theory for the spinless case was considered in Ref. [27]. The classical theories of spinning "particles" corresponding to the general formalism and the projected one will be given elsewhere [28].)

Let us begin by noting that in the positive mass subspace, the Hamiltonian reads

$$\Lambda\mathcal{H}\Lambda = \Lambda\sqrt{\mathcal{H}^2}\Lambda. \tag{6}$$

Then, we see that the Feynman Hamiltonian (linear in the momenta) is reduced to the squared root form, which was originally proposed by Johnson (see Ref. [20]) for playing the role of Hamiltonian in an indefinite mass context. Actually, Johnson only considered tardyons in his formalism. However, this restriction is too strong. (Notice that tachyons are also needed in the Fourier representation of the free Feynman propagator.) In the free case the Hamiltonian adopts an expression, $\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}$, which is independent of the spin. As the projection is invariant under the "proper time" evolution (since $[\mathcal{H},\Lambda] = 0$ and $d\Lambda/ds = 0$), from (4) and (6) we obtain

$$\Lambda\frac{dq}{ds}\Lambda = -i\Lambda[\sqrt{\mathcal{H}^2}, q]\Lambda. \tag{7}$$

This equation helps us to get insight into the meaning of the parametrization (3).

Let us now take the classical limit in order to show that the formalism restricted to the positive mass subspace is an off-shell classical theory [27], in which the evolution parameter can be even identified with the proper time without additional assumptions. Besides, from this procedure it can be immediately seen that such an on-shell classical theory includes the standard one.

To perform this limit we use a generalization of the well-known quasiclassical states (see Appendix). First, notice that if A and B are operators and $f(B)$ is an operator function, then

$$[A, f(B)] = \frac{1}{2}\frac{df}{dB}[A,B] + [A,B]\frac{1}{2}\frac{df}{dB} + \mathcal{O}(\hbar^2). \tag{8}$$

[2]For example, in Eq. (2) is implicit that only the states associated with real eigenvalues contribute to the spectral decomposition of the identity operator in terms of the generalized eigenvectors of x^μ.

Therefore, to first order in $\hbar$, we have

$$\Lambda\frac{dq}{ds}\Lambda = \Lambda\frac{1}{2}(\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\mathcal{H}^2}}[-i\mathcal{H}^2,q]+[-i\mathcal{H}^2,q]\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\mathcal{H}^2}})\Lambda. \quad (9)$$

Now, we take mean values with positive mass quasiclassical states. It means that we consider states of the form $\Psi_c(x^\mu) = u\Phi_c(x^\mu)$, where $\Phi_c(x^\mu)$ is a minimum uncertainty Gaussian wave packet (see Appendix) and u is a constant spinor satisfying

$$\gamma^\mu\langle\pi_\mu(0)\rangle_c\, u = \sqrt{\langle\pi^\mu(0)\rangle_c\langle\pi_\mu(0)\rangle_c}\, u, \quad (10)$$

for which can be proved that

$$\Lambda\Psi_c = [1+\mathcal{O}(\hbar)]\Psi_c. \quad (11)$$

By taking account of Eq. (A1) given in the Appendix, we obtain for minimal coupling (restoring $\hbar$)

$$\langle\frac{dq}{ds}\rangle_c = \frac{d\langle q\rangle_c}{ds} = \frac{1}{2i\hbar\langle\sqrt{\pi^\mu\pi_\mu}\rangle_c}\langle[\pi^\mu\pi_\mu - \frac{e\hbar}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}, q]\rangle_c. \quad (12)$$

Notice that $|\pi^\mu\pi_\mu| \gg |(e\hbar/2)\sigma^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}|$, so we have neglected the spin term in the square root and consistently retained it in the commutator. From Eq. (12), we can obtain the equation of motion on-shell of the classical variable $\langle q\rangle_c$ as given by the standard relativistic mechanics, e.g., the Lorentz force law and the Bargmann-Michel-Telegdi equations [28].

For the sake of simplicity we will only consider the free case from now on. In this case, Eq. (12) reads

$$\frac{d\langle q\rangle_c}{ds} = \frac{1}{2i\hbar\langle\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}\rangle_c}\langle[p^\mu p_\mu, q]\rangle_c. \quad (13)$$

This equation is also a very important relation that establishes a connection among different parametrizations [29]. In fact, the Stückelberg-Schwinger parametrization leads in the classical limit to a Heisenberg equation of motion without the factor $1/(2\langle\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}\rangle_c)$, which now appears in a direct way. On the other hand, RD and FSF have also considered a parametrization which resembles that given in Eq. (13) using a second order Hamiltonian [see Eq. (1)]. As we have mentioned (see footnote 1), in the classical limit it would be possible, in principle, to fix the initial conditions such that $\langle p^\mu p_\mu\rangle_c$ be equal to a desirable fixed value. In order to compare RD and FSF parametrizations[3] with Eq. (13) on-shell, we should identify such a value with M^2. However, observe that the "super-mass" M is an "intrinsic parameter" not related *a priori* to any mass value (see, e.g., the second work of Ref. [10]). Moreover, we can also note that from the point of view that RD and FSF can be derived by contracting the de Sitter group [14] (a sort of "super-nonrelativistic limit") the eigenvalues $p^\mu p_\mu$ must be smaller than M^2 [18]. This fact is not compatible with the relation $\langle p^\mu p_\mu\rangle_c = M^2$. On the other hand, if one retains such an identification at the quantum level it turns out to be a non-desirable feature because the Hamiltonian becomes state dependent. Likewise, if at the same level one identifies M with a particular mass value (e.g., m_0, eventually, an eigenvalue m), the indefinite mass character of the theory is in trouble. This is a known criticism made to the Fock parametrization (see the first paper of Ref. [20]).

Let us now show that the parameter s is reduced to the proper time. From Eq. (7) we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}(\Lambda x^\mu\Lambda) = \Lambda\frac{dx^\mu}{ds}\Lambda = \Lambda\frac{p^\mu}{\sqrt{p^\alpha p_\alpha}}\Lambda. \quad (14)$$

Integrating it we obtain

$$\Lambda[x^\mu(s) - x^\mu(0)]\Lambda = \Lambda\frac{p^\mu}{\sqrt{p^\alpha p_\alpha}}\Lambda s. \quad (15)$$

If we now take mean values on a positive mass quasiclassical state with $\langle p^\mu\rangle_c\langle p_\mu\rangle_c > 0$ (tardyons) up to the first order in $\hbar$, and we consider the rest frame ($\langle\vec{p}\rangle_c = 0$), then

$$\langle[x^0(s) - x^0(0)]\rangle_c = \mathrm{sgn}\langle p^0\rangle_c s, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathrm{sgn}\langle p^0\rangle_c$ is 1 or -1 for an extended notion of "particle" or "antiparticle" states, respectively. (In the same way that $\mathrm{sgn}\langle p^0\rangle_c$ classifies particle and antiparticle states in the mass definite theory, this notion is even valid for the indefinite mass framework [19] [cf. Ref. [1]).] Thus, the parameter s is the expectation value of x^0 in the rest frame in agreement with the classical notion for particle states. Moreover, the Stückelberg interpretation for antiparticles, as particles moving backward in the time x_0, is derived from (16). Finally, using (13) for the four position [taking into account Eq. (14)], we obtain

$$\frac{d}{ds}\langle x^\mu\rangle_c\frac{d}{ds}\langle x_\mu\rangle_c = \frac{\langle p^\mu\rangle_c\langle p_\mu\rangle_c}{\langle\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}\rangle_c^2} = 1 \quad (17)$$

(for both, "particle" and "antiparticle" corresponding to the off-shell theory), since $\langle\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}\rangle_c^2 = \langle p^\mu\rangle_c\langle p_\mu\rangle_c$ by the factorization property.

Therefore, *ds is reduced to the arc element of the indefinite mass system that follows the world line* $\langle x^\mu(s)\rangle_c$.

[3]Strictly speaking, in these parametrizations there is no restriction onto the positive mass subspace; then $\langle p^\mu p_\mu\rangle_c$ also includes $-\langle\sqrt{p^\mu p_\mu}\rangle_c$ values, which correspond to the negative mass subspace.

We would like to thank A. Kálnay and S. Sonego for many illuminating discussions. We are grateful to M.

Gadella for technical remarks. We also acknowledge Universidad de Buenos Aires for our research fellowships.

APPENDIX:

We define as quasiclassical state $\Psi_c(x^\mu)$ any state that satisfies the factorization property,

$$\lim_{\hbar\to 0}(\langle AB\rangle_c - \langle A\rangle_c\langle B\rangle_c) = 0, \tag{A1}$$

for any orbital (no spin) operators A and B, where $\langle A\rangle_c = \langle\Psi_c|A|\Psi_c\rangle/\langle\Psi_c|\Psi_c\rangle$.

Let us note that if we consider states of the form $\Psi_c(x^\mu) = u\Phi_c(x^\mu)$ where u is a constant spinor, then

$$\langle\Psi_c|\Psi_c\rangle = \overline{u}u\int \Phi_c^*(x^\mu)\Phi_c(x^\mu)d^4x. \tag{A2}$$

Therefore, for any orbital operator A we have that

$$\langle A\rangle_c = \int \Phi_c^*(x^\mu)A(x^\mu, i\partial_\mu)\Phi_c(x^\mu)d^4x, \tag{A3}$$

which is nothing else than the spin 0 expression of the mean value corresponding to the five dimensional Galilean invariant parametrization of the Klein-Gordon equation [14] [we have taken the normalization $\int \Phi_c^*(x^\mu)\Phi_c(x^\mu)d^4x = 1$]. Then, the problem of defining a state satisfying condition (A1) is independent of the "norm" $\langle\Psi_c|\Psi_c\rangle = \overline{u}u$, i.e., the factorization property does not depend on the indefiniteness of the metric, since the problem has been essentially reduced to the spin 0 case mentioned above where the norm is positive definite. In this case, a class of states satisfying (A1) was previously introduced by Cooke (Ref. [15]),

$$\Phi_c(x^\mu) = \frac{1}{2\pi(\Delta_c x^0\Delta_c x^1\Delta_c x^2\Delta_c x^3)^{1/2}} \cdot \exp\Big\{-\frac{i}{\hbar}\langle p_\mu(0)\rangle_c x^\mu - \sum_\mu\Big[\frac{x^\mu - \langle x^\mu(0)\rangle_c}{2\Delta_c x^\mu}\Big]^2\Big\}, \tag{A4}$$

which correspond to minimum uncertainty Gaussian wave packets ($\Delta_c x^{(\mu)}\Delta_c p^{(\mu)} = \hbar/2$, $\mu = 0, ..., 3$), centered in $\langle x^\mu(0)\rangle_c$ and $\langle p_\mu(0)\rangle_c$. The proof that the wave packets (A4) satisfy (A1) follows the same steps as in the nonrelativistic case. A lengthy, however straightforward, demonstration of this property can be made by computing $\langle x_\mu^n p_\nu^m\rangle$, considering that any operator can be expressed as a power series of the canonical variables. For a more direct argument see Ref. [30].

As a final remark, we can note that the scalar function (A4) loses its Gaussian form as it is seen from another system of coordinates $\{x'^\mu\}$: $\Phi_c(x^\mu) = \Phi_c'(x'^\mu) \neq \Phi_c(x'^\mu)$. However, the property (A1) stands for any inertial system, since the Lorentz transformation is unitary in our formalism. That is,

$$\Psi_c'(x^\mu) = \mathcal{L}\Psi_c(x^\mu), \tag{A5a}$$

$$\mathcal{L} = \exp[\frac{i}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu}(L^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^{\mu\nu})], \tag{A5b}$$

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}\overline{\mathcal{L}} = I. \tag{A5c}$$

In fact, it is easy to check that Eq. (A1) is also valid for two operators $A' = \overline{\mathcal{L}}A\mathcal{L}$ and $B' = \overline{\mathcal{L}}B\mathcal{L}$,

$$\lim_{\hbar\to 0}(\langle A'B'\rangle_c - \langle A'\rangle_c\langle B'\rangle_c) = 0, \tag{A6}$$

and then, from Eqs. (A5) we finally have

$$\lim_{\hbar\to 0}(\langle AB\rangle_{c'} - \langle A\rangle_{c'}\langle B\rangle_{c'}) = 0, \quad \forall A, B. \tag{A7}$$

[1] E.C.G. Stückelberg, Helv. Phys. Acta **14** (1941) 322; **14** (1941) 558; **15** (1942) 23. See also R.P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **74** (1948) 939; **76** (1949) 749.

[2] J.R. Fanchi, Am. J. Phys. **49** (1981) 850; Found. Phys. **11** (1981) 493. See also B. Thaller, Lett. Nuovo Cimento **31** (1981) 439.

[3] W.C. Davidon, Phys. Rev. **97** (1955) 1131; **97** (1955) 1139; A.O. Barut, Found. Phys. **18** (1988) 95; C.R. Stephens, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **181** (1988) 120.

[4] P.A.M. Dirac, Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A **110** (1926) 405; **110** (1926) 661.

[5] V. Fock, Phys. Z. Sowjetunion **12** (1937) 404.

[6] R.P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **80** (1950) 440.

[7] R.P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **84** (1951) 108. A review of Feynman's work can be found in S.S. Schweber, Rev. Mod. Phys. **58** (1986) 449.

[8] Y. Nambu, Prog. Theor. Phys. **5** (1950) 82.

[9] J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82** (1951) 664.

[10] L.P. Horwitz and C. Piron, Helv. Phys. Acta **46** (1973) 316; R. Arshansky and L.P. Horwitz, J. Math. Phys. **30** (1989) 380, and references therein.

[11] R.E. Collins and J.R. Fanchi, Nuovo Cimento A **48** (1978) 314; J.R. Fanchi, Found. Phys. **20** (1990) 189, and references therein.

[12] C. Dewdney, P.R. Holland, A. Kyprianidis, and J.P. Vigier, Phys. Lett. A **114** (1986) 440. See also A. Kyprianidis, Phys. Rep. **155** (1987) 2 and references cited therein. See also P. Droz-Vincent, Phys. Lett. A **134** (1988) 147.

[13] Some exceptions are the works of C. Piron and F. Reuse, Helv. Phys. Acta **51** (1978) 146, F. Reuse, *ibid.* **51** (1978) 157, and L.P. Horwitz and R. Arshansky, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **15** (1982) L659, where the spin 1/2 case was considered in a different formalism from that of Ref. [9].

[14] J.J. Aghassi, P. Roman, and R.M. Santilli, Phys. Rev. D **1** (1970) 2753; J. Math. Phys. **11** (1970) 2297.

[15] In the same line, see also J.H. Cooke, Phys. Rev. **166** (1968) 1293; L. Hostler, J. Math. Phys. **21** (1980) 2461; S. Sonego, Phys. Rev. A **44** (1991) 5369.

[16] J.R. Fanchi, Phys. Rev. A **34** (1986) 1677.
[17] L.P. Horwitz, Found. Phys. **22** (1992) 421. See also Ref. [14].
[18] F.H. Gaioli and E.T. Garcia Alvarez, *Proper time wave equations and irreducible representations of the de Sitter group* (unpublished).
[19] F.H. Gaioli and E.T. Garcia Alvarez, *The notion of "particle" in the Feynman parametrization of the Dirac equation* (unpublished).
[20] Previous proposals similar to the one presented here have been considered by J.E. Johnson, Phys. Rev. **181** (1969) 1755; Phys. Rev. D **3** (1971) 1735; H. Rumpf, Gen. Rel. Grav. **10** (1979) 509; A.O. Barut and W. Thacker, Phys. Rev. D **31** (1985) 1836.
[21] J.P. Aparicio, F.H. Gaioli, and E.T. Garcia Alvarez, *Formulación de la Mecánica Cuántica Relativista parametrizada con un tiempo propio*, Anales Asoc. Fís. Arg. 1992 **4** (in press).
[22] The indefinite metric spaces were already discussed in the literature. See, e.g., W. Pauli, Rev. Mod. Phys. **15** (1943) 175; H. Fesbach and F. Villars, Rev. Mod. Phys. **30** (1958) 24.
[23] The "scalar product" (2) was also used by Johnson (see Ref. [20]) and Rumpf (see Ref. [20]). A similar expression was also considered by M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **143** (1982) 127.
[24] This result is valid for any indefinite metric space. See, e.g., L.K. Pandit, Suppl. Nuovo Cimento **11** (1959) 157; P.N. Dobson, Jr., J. Math. Phys. **12** (1971) 1207.
[25] The projector (5) was also used by J.E. Johnson and K.K. Chang, Phys. Rev. D **10** (1974) 2421 and by H. Enatsu and S. Kawaguchi, Nuovo Cimento **27A** (1975) 458.
[26] J.P. Aparicio, F.H. Gaioli, E.T. Garcia Alvarez, and A.J. Kálnay, *Proper time approach to the localization problem: a reinterpretation of the Feynman-Bunge covariant position for spin 1/2 systems* (unpublished); A.O. Barut and A.J. Bracken, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 2454. See also a heuristic treatment in M. Bunge and A.J. Kálnay, Prog. Theor. Phys. **42** (1969) 1445.
[27] H.E. Moses, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **52** (1969) 444.
[28] F.H. Gaioli and E.T. Garcia Alvarez, *Classical and quantum equations of motion of spinning particles* (unpublished). A preliminary treatment can be found in J.P. Aparicio, F.H. Gaioli, E.T. Garcia Alvarez, D.F. Hurtado de Mendoza, and A.J. Kálnay, Anales Asoc. Fís. Arg. **3** (1991) 46; **3** (1991) 51.
[29] A detailed discussion about the connection among different proposals of proper time derivative, including the analysis of some heuristic proposals, can be found in J.P. Aparicio, F.H. Gaioli, and E.T. Garcia Alvarez, Phys. Rev. A **51** (1995) 96.
[30] L.G. Yaffe, Rev. Mod. Phys. **54** (1982) 407.